



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/790,847

03/03/2004

Youenn Fablet

01807.101570.

2498

5514

7590

12/23/2008

FITZPATRICK CELLA HARPER & SCINTO
30 ROCKEFELLER PLAZA
NEW YORK, NY 10112

EXAMINER

ZAHR, ASHRAF A

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2175

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

12/23/2008

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/790,847	Applicant(s) FABLET, YOUENN	
	Examiner ASHRAF ZAHR	Art Unit 2175	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 10/13/2008.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-24 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-24 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 12/18/2008 has been entered.

Response to Arguments

2. Applicant argues, "Lonroth is not seen to teach the features of the invention, and in particular, with regard to Claims 1 and 16, Lonroth is not seen to teach the features of sending, from the server computer that provides the service to a client computer, a service description document defining the type of data exchanged between the server and any client when the service is executed, the document comprising a description of a processing functionality implemented during a preprocessing or post-processing of data in XML format of a message exchanged during the execution of the service on the communication network".

Lonroth discloses, "the XML document generated by pre-processor 240 in response to a service request is referred to herein as a XML request document. The XML request document includes links that identify the information sources that correspond to the requested service. As shall be described in greater detail hereafter, the XML document may also include metadata, inserted by the pre-processor 240, that

Art Unit: 2175

is used by the various components of post processor 244 (Lonroth, col 5, ln 30-52)".

The examiner reads this as a description of the processing functionality implemented during a preprocessing or post-processing of data. Therefore, the examiner respectfully disagrees with the applicant.

3. Applicant also argues, "Lonroth does not disclose, "the features of extracting from a service description document a description of a processing functionality implemented during a preprocessing or a post-processing of data in XML format of a message exchanged during the execution of the service on the communication network, and verifying whether processing is supported by the client computer in the communication network when processing is obligatory and must be executed by the client computer in the communication network".

Lonroth searches a configuration database to determine how to construct the XML document. The information in the database can be a phone number or user id combination. The examiner reads as determining verifying whether the processing is supported by client computer as the document must e constructed in a manner supported by the client. Therefore, the examiner respectfully disagrees with the applicant.

4. Applicant also argues, "As for Claims 14 and 18, Lonroth is not seen to teach the features of extracting from a service description document a processing from a received message, acquiring from the service description document at least one

Art Unit: 2175

imperative value associated with a property of processing, and verifying whether the imperative value is included in a list of values which can be attributed to a property supported by the functionality described in the service description document”

Lonroth searches a configuration database to determine how to construct the XML document. The information in the database can be a phone number user id combination. The XML request document includes links that identify the information sources that correspond to the requested service. Therefore, the examiner respectfully disagrees with the applicant.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

5. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

6. Claims 1-12, 14-16, 18-19, 21-22, 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Lonroth et al., US 6,826,597 (Hereinafter, Lonroth).

Regarding Claim 1, Lonroth discloses a “method of offering a service provided by a server computer in a communication network”. Specifically, Lonroth discloses a

Art Unit: 2175

method and system for allowing an arbitrary client to be serviced by a single application is described (Lonnroth, col 3, ln 49-51).

Lonnroth also discloses “comprising sending, from a server computer that provides a service to a client computer, a service description document defining the type of data exchanged between said server and any client when said service is executed”. Specifically, the XML document generated by pre-processor 240 in response to a service request is referred to herein as a XML request document. The XML request document includes links that identify the information sources that correspond to the requested service. As shall be described in greater detail hereafter, the XML document may also include metadata, inserted by the pre-processor 240, that is used by the various components of post processor 244 (Lonnroth, col 5, ln 30-52).

Lonnroth also discloses “the document comprising a description of a processing functionality implemented during a preprocessing or post-processing of data in XML format of a message exchanged during the execution of said service on the communication network”. Specifically, As shall be described in greater detail hereafter, the XML document may also include metadata, inserted by the pre-processor 240, that is used by the various components of post processor 244 (Lonnroth, col 5, ln 30-52)

Regarding Claim 2, Lonnroth discloses a “method according to Claim 1, wherein said processing functionality defines processings adapted to produce or use data in XML format defined in a first abstract part of a service description document”.

Art Unit: 2175

Specifically, those request objects take the form of XML documents (Lonroth, col 4 , In 10-15).

Regarding Claim 3, Lonroth discloses a “method according to Claim 2, wherein the description of said processing functionality is inserted in said first abstract part of the service description document”. Specifically, the metadata may contain data that identifies the particular client that issued a request, the device type of the client, the protocol supported by that client, the user currently using the client, the service requested by the client, and various parameters associated with the requested service (Lonroth, col 9, In 32-37).

Regarding Claim 4, Lonroth discloses a “method according to Claim 1, wherein said preprocessing or said post-processing is implemented via a script language”. Specifically, post processor has an XSL engine (Lonroth, col 7, In 40-50).

Regarding Claim 5, Lonroth discloses a “method according to Claim 1, wherein said processing functionality is defined as a data item in XML format in a first abstract part of a service description document”. Specifically, the metadata may contain data that identifies the particular client that issued a request, the device type of the client, the protocol supported by that client, the user currently using the client, the service requested by the client, and various parameters associated with the requested service (Lonroth, col 9, In 32-37).

Regarding Claim 6, Lonroth discloses a “method according to Claim 5, wherein said data item in XML format defining said processing functionality is encoded in a second concrete part of the service description document”. Specifically, the metadata may contain data that identifies the particular client that issued a request, the device type of the client, the protocol supported by that client, the user currently using the client, the service requested by the client, and various parameters associated with the requested service (Lonroth, col 9, ln 32-37).

Regarding Claim 7, Lonroth discloses a “method according to Claim 1, wherein the description of said processing functionality comprises a list of properties supported by said processing functionality, said properties defining at least respectively”(Lonroth, col 8, ln 21-37). Furthermore, Lonroth also discloses the style sheet for each device includes general instructions about how data should be formatted for the device (Lonroth, col 8, ln 39-52).

Lonroth discloses a “the node in the communication network adapted to execute said processing”. Specifically discloses a pre-processor and post-processor (col 4, ln 6-10).

Lonroth discloses a “the type of processing”. Specifically discloses XML processing (col 6, ln 1-10).

Regarding Claim 8, Lonroth discloses a “method according to Claim 7, wherein said processing functionality also comprises a property adapted to specify whether said processing is carried out on the sending or reception of said message”. Specifically, the post-processor receives XML responses from the XML processor and a filtering unit selectively filters XL response documents based on filtering rules (Lonroth, col 7, ln 40-50).

Regarding Claim 9, Lonroth discloses a “method according to Claim 7, wherein said processing functionality also comprises a property adapted to specify the message or a set of messages to which said processing applies”. Specifically, XSL style sheets contain instructions about how each type of data item that can be contained in an XML document should be formatted prior to transmission to the client (Lonroth, col 8, ln 20-25).

Regarding Claim 10, Lonroth discloses a “method according to Claim 7, wherein said processing functionality also comprises a property adapted to define the data produced or used by said processing, and possibly the type of said data”. Specifically, XSL style sheets contain instructions about how each type of data item that can be contained in an XML document should be formatted prior to transmission to the client (Lonroth, col 8, ln 20-25).

Regarding Claim 11, Lonroth discloses a “method according to Claim 7, wherein the description of said processing functionality comprises a property adapted to specify whether the processing to be carried out is obligatory or optional”. Specifically, upon receiving a service request, the pre-processor performs any operations that are required prior to servicing the request (Lonroth, col 5, ln 22-25).

Regarding Claim 12, Lonroth discloses a “method according to Claim 7, wherein, for at least one property supported by said processing functionality, the description of said processing functionality comprises a list of values attributable to said property”. Specifically, in one embodiment, information about which services are authorized for each client are stored in a configuration database (Lonroth, col 5, ln 28-30).

Regarding Claim 14, Lonroth discloses a “method of validating a message received by an intermediate computer in a communication network, from a service description document comprising a description of a processing functionality implemented during a reprocessing or the post-processing of data in XML format of the message exchanged during the execution of a service on the communication network”. Specifically, such operations may include, for example, performing security checks to determine whether the client issuing the request is authorized to issue the request (Lonroth, col 5, ln 25-30).

Lonnroth also discloses “extracting from said service description document a processing from the message received”. Specifically, the pre-processor generates based on the request and information contained in configuration database, a request object in the form of an XML document (Lonnroth, col 5, ln 31-35).

Lonnroth also discloses “acquiring from said service description document at least one imperative value associated with a property of the processing”. Specifically, the pre-processor generates based on the request and information contained in configuration database, a request object in the form of an XML document (Lonnroth, col 5, ln 31-35).

Lonnroth also discloses “verifying whether said imperative value is included in a list of values which can be attributed to a property supported by said processing functionality described in the service description document”. Specifically, the XML document generated by pre-processor 240 in response to a service request is referred to herein as a XML request document. The XML request document includes links that identify the information sources that correspond to the requested service. As shall be described in greater detail hereafter, the XML document may also include metadata, inserted by the pre-processor 240, that is used by the various components of post processor 244 (Lonnroth, col 5, ln 30-52).

Regarding Claim 15, Lonnroth also discloses “reading the value associated with a property adapted to specify whether the processing is executed before or after the

Art Unit: 2175

sending of said message". Specifically, upon receiving a service request, the pre-processor performs any operations that are required prior to servicing the request (Lonroth, col 5, ln 22-25).

Lonroth also discloses "executing said processing when said value is adapted to specify that the processing must be executed before the sending of the message". Specifically, the post-processor receives XML responses from the XML processor and a filtering unit selectively filters XL response documents based on filtering rules (Lonroth, col 7, ln 40-50).

Regarding Claim 16, applicant claims a device with the means for performing the method in claim 1. This claim is substantially similar to the method of claim 1 and is therefore rejected based upon the same reasoning used to reject claim 1.

Regarding Claim 18, applicant claims a device with the means for performing the method in claim 14. This claim is substantially similar to the method of claim 14 and is therefore rejected based upon the same reasoning used to reject claim 14.

Regarding Claim 19, Lonroth also discloses "server computer in a communication network, comprising means adapted to implement the method of offering a service according to Claim 1" (Lonroth, Fig 2: node 110, col 5, ln 18).

Regarding Claim 21, Lonroth also discloses a “computer in a communication network, comprising means adapted to implement the method of validating a message according to Claim 14” (Lonroth, Fig 3, col 11, ln 7-8).

Regarding Claim 22, applicant claims a “computer-readable storage medium on which is stored a computer executable program to implement the method of offering a service according to Claim 1”. This claim is substantially similar to claim 1 and is therefore rejected based upon the same reasoning used to reject claim 1.

Regarding Claim 24, applicant claims a “computer-readable storage medium on which is stored a computer executable program to implement the method of validating a message according to Claim 14”. This claim is substantially similar to claim 14 and is therefore rejected based upon the same reasoning used to reject claim 14.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

7. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

8. Claims 13,17,20,23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lonroth et al., US 6,826,597 (Hereinafter, Lonroth).

Regarding Claim 13, Lonroth discloses a “method of testing access to a service by a client computer in a communication network, from a service description document, comprising the following steps implemented by said client computer”. Specifically, Lonroth discloses a method and system for allowing an arbitrary client to be serviced by a single application is described (Lonroth, col 3, ln 49-51).

Lonroth also discloses a “extracting from said service description document a description of a processing functionality implemented during a preprocessing or the post-processing of data in XML format of a message exchanged during the execution of the service on the communication network”. Specifically, XML gateways are mechanisms for converting between XML and messages produced by other types of data sources (Lonroth, col 6, ln 8-10).

Lonroth also discloses “reading a value associated with a property adapted to specify a node in the communication network adapted to execute the processing”. Specifically, the XML gateways that are called by XML processor in response to a particular XML request document are XML gateways that are connected to the data sources have the information identified in the XML request document (Lonroth, col 6, ln 26-35).

Lonroth also discloses a “reading a value of a property adapted to specify whether the processing is obligatory or optional”. Specifically, upon receiving a service request, the pre-processor performs any operations that are required prior to servicing the request (Lonroth, col 5, ln 22-25).

Lonnroth also discloses a “verifying whether the processing is supported by the client computer in the communication network when said processing is obligatory and must be executed by said client computer in the communication network”. Specifically, such operations may include, for example, performing security checks to determine whether the client issuing the request is authorized to issue the request (Lonnroth, col 5, ln 25-30).

Lonnroth does not specifically, disclose implementing all the steps above on the client device. However, it would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to implement the steps on the client device. The motivation to do so is that Lonnroth states the set of services that may be requested by one client may be different then service requested by another client (Lonnroth, col 4, ln 58-60). It would be obvious to verify the services at the client level to allow the client to only use the service that it requested and not another client requested.

Regarding Claim 17, applicant claims a device with the means for performing the method in claim 13. This claim is substantially similar to the method of claim 13 and is therefore rejected based upon the same reasoning used to reject claim 13.

Regarding Claim 20, Lonnroth also discloses a “client computer in a communication network, comprising means adapted to implement the method of testing access according to Claim 13” (Lonnroth, col 4, ln 30).

Regarding Claim 23, applicant claims a “computer-readable storage medium on which is stored a computer executable program to implement the method of testing access according to Claim 13”. This claim is substantially similar to claim 13 and is therefore rejected based upon the same reasoning used to reject claim 13.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to ASHRAF ZAHR whose telephone number is (571)270-1973. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 9:30 am - 6 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, William Bashore can be reached on (571)272-4088. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2175

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

AAZ 12/172008

/WILLIAM L. BASHORE/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2175